

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/424,487

Applicant(s)
Choo et al.

Examiner
Hope Robinson

Group Art Unit
1653



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hope Robinson (3) Joe Liebeschuetz
(2) Christopher Low (4) _____

Date of Interview Apr 24, 2002

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal (copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative)

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: Restriction Requirement

Identification of prior art discussed:

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. Liebeschuetz noted in the response to the restriction requirement that there is a related application 09/424,488 in which the restriction requirement established was different than the one instituted in the present application. Informed Mr. Liebeschuetz that the restriction requirement could be clarified in the office action on the merits or a supplemental restriction requirement could be issued. It was agreed that as applicant elected an office action on the merits would be submitted setting forth the restriction groups so as not to delay prosecution on the application. Mr. Liebeschuetz inquired as to whether all references were received in the present file that are listed on the IDS. Informed Mr. Liebeschuetz that most of the references are missing from the file. Mr. Liebeschuetz indicated that he had a post card receipt and would resubmit the references to the PTO, however, would like the references to be considered in both applications.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.